

REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the cancellation herein without prejudice of claim 12, claims 11 and 13 to 22 are currently pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Allowed Claims 13 and 18

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that claims 13 and 18 are allowed.

III. Rejection of Claims 11, 14 to 17, 21, and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 11, 14 to 17, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over “Incorporating LR Parsing Into SPHINX,” International Conference on Acoustics, Speech & Signal Processing, April 1991 (“Kita et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claim 11 relates to a method for recognizing speech from a word sequence. Claim 11 recites that the method includes applying a first recognition procedure to a first segment of the word sequence. Claim 11 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite that the first recognition procedure includes a digram recognition method with integrated unique syntax. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on page 5, lines 16 to 21 of the Specification. Claim 11 further recites that the method includes applying a second recognition procedure to a second segment of the word sequence. Claim 11 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite that the second recognition procedure including a statistical word sequence evaluation. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on page 5, lines 23 to 26 of the Specification. Claim 11 recites that the method includes combining a last two words of the plurality of first words into a pseudoword upon a change from the first recognition procedure, *i.e.*, a digram recognition method with integrated unique syntax, to the second recognition procedure, *i.e.*, a statistical word sequence evaluation.

Kita et al. describe that a system first uses a context-free grammar to recognize speech and then, if, at some point during recognition, the system fails to grow some paths by using the context-free grammar, then the system will use bigram grammar for these paths. Thus, Kita et al. describe a system in which context-free grammar is first use and bigram

grammar is subsequently used. This is in stark contrast to the method recited in claim 11, in which a first recognition procedure is a digram recognition method with integrated unique syntax, in which a second recognition procedure is a statistical word sequence evaluation and in which a last two words of a plurality of first words are combined into a pseudoword upon a change from the first recognition procedure, *i.e.*, a digram recognition method with integrated unique syntax, to the second recognition procedure, *i.e.*, a statistical word sequence evaluation.

In view of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Kita et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in amended claim 11. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Kita et al. do not render unpatentable claim 11.

As for claims 14 to 17, 21 and 22, which depend ultimately depend from claim 11 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 11, it is respectfully submitted that Kita et al. do not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 11.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As regards the rejection of claim 12, while Applicants do not necessarily agree with the merits of this rejection, claim 12 has been amended herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the present rejection. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 19 and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Kita et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,732,394 ("Nakadai et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, the Examiner will note that claim 19 has been amended herein without prejudice to depend from claim 11, and claim 20 now ultimately depends from claim 11. As more fully set forth above, Kita et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 11. Since Nakadai et al. do not overcome the deficiencies noted above with respect to Kita et al., it is respectfully submitted that the combination Kita et al.

and Nakadai et al. does not render unpatentable claims 19 or 20 for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 11.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 15, 2005 By: Richard L. Mayer
Reg. No. 22,490

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO 26646